

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

---

NO. 05-10003-NMG-02

---

UNITED STATES

v.

DENNIS ALBERTELLI,  
Defendant

---

**MOTION FOR ORDER REGARDING WIRETAP LOGS**

Pursuant to Local Rule 116.4(B)(2), the defendant Dennis Albertelli moves that the Court enter the attached Order governing the future use of wiretap logs. In support of this motion, the defendant states:

1. The defendant has asked the government to provide him with a copy of the logs maintained by law enforcement officials as they executed the electronic surveillance in this case. The government has agreed to provide defendants with those logs, so long as the future use of the logs is governed by the provisions of Local Rule 116.4(B)(2) (prohibiting use of preliminary transcripts at trial or hearing without prior approval of the court based on certain findings). The defendants who were present in Court at the March 6, 2006 conference agreed that such an order should issue.

WHEREFORE, the defendant Dennis Albertelli moves that the Court enter the attached

Order, making it clear that the restrictions of Local Rule 116.4(B)(2) govern all future use of the logs by all defendants.

Respectfully submitted

/s/ Charles W. Rankin

---

Charles W. Rankin  
BBO No. 411780  
Rankin & Sultan  
151 Merrimac St., Second Floor  
Boston, MA 02114-4717  
(617) 720-0011

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this document filed through the ECF system will be sent electronically to the registered participants as identified on the Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) and paper copies will be sent to those indicated as non participants on March 7, 2006

/s/ Charles W. Rankin

---

Charles W. Rankin

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

---

NO. 05-10003-NMG

---

UNITED STATES

v.

ARTHUR GIANELLI, et al,  
Defendants

---

**ORDER REGARDING WIRETAP LOGS**

In response to a request by certain defendants, the government has agreed to provide defendants with a copy of the logs maintained by law enforcement personnel as they executed electronic surveillance in this case (hereinafter “wiretap logs”), provided that the future use of the wiretap logs is governed by the provisions of Local Rule 116.4(B)(2). Having heard from the parties at the hearing on March 6, 2006, the Court hereby orders that all future use of the wiretap logs will be governed by Local Rule 116.4(B)(2).

---

Date

---

Timothy S. Hillman  
United States Magistrate Judge